

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 14, and 15 have been amended to address the rejection under 35 U.S.C., §112, 2nd Paragraph.

The rejection of claim 14 as being anticipated by Carre et al is respectfully traversed. In response to the previous amendment, the examiner remarks that “the multi-discs shown in Carre et al. does not preclude a single disc as the claims do not recite the terms ‘consisting’.” Claim 14 first of all does not recite a single disc and it is not clear what distinction the examiner is trying to make. Claim 14 recites a method of controlling an automotive braking system in which front and back brakes are provided, with the front brakes including a pair of rotatable wheel hubs, at least two spot-type brake discs mounted on each of the wheel hubs and supported for rotation with the wheel hubs and for axially sliding movement on the wheel hubs and with each disc presenting opposite circumferentially continuous annular braking surfaces. Claim 14 further recites at least three spot-type friction elements as being mounted on a stationary brake caliper associated with each wheel hub and interleaved with the associated brake discs. The friction elements are further recited as being circumferentially discontinuous as to overly only an angular sector of the annular braking surfaces of the brake discs. At least two of the friction elements are axially slid able on the caliper for engaging and disengaging the braking surfaces of the brake disc. The method further includes controlling the addtitude and movement of the brake discs with respect to the wheel hub, and also controlling the attitude and movement of the friction elements with respect to the caliper to maintain the

Appln. No.: 10/089,011
Amdt. dated October 19, 2004
Reply to Office action of August 23, 2004

brake disc and friction elements in parallel alignment during sliding movement into and out of braking engagement with one another.

It is not clear from the disclosure of Carre et. al. whether the discs 1a and 1b are both slidable axially on the hub, as required by claim 14, and particularly with respect to disc 1b which appears to be fixed by what appears to be a bolt in relation to the support structure 3. Accordingly, one must speculate as to whether the limitation of having at least two brake discs slidable on the hub is met by Carre et. al., and that is not the test for anticipation.

Moreover, the step of controlling the attitude and movement of the brake discs as called for by claim 14 is not shown in Carre, nor is the step of further controlling the attitude and movement of the friction members so as to maintain the recited parallel relationship of the disc and friction members during movement into and out of frictional engagement. This distinction was pointed out in the last amendment and the examiner failed to address it as well.

Claim 14 further requires the friction elements to be spot-type elements which are circumferentially discontinuous. It is not clear from the disclosure of Carre et. al whether the friction members 4a, 4b, and 4c are annular circumferentially continuous disc-type frictional elements, which would fail to meet the requirement of having the friction elements overly only an angular sector of the annular braking surfaces of the brake discs. This distinction was also raised in the last amendment and has not been addressed by the examiner.

For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 14 based on Carre et. al. is improper and should be withdrawn.

Appln. No.: 10/089,011
Amdt. dated October 19, 2004
Reply to Office action of August 23, 2004

Newly submitted claim 16 is likewise believed to distinguish applicant's invention patentably over Carre et. al. Claim 16 recites a braking system for a road-going vehicle having a set of front wheels and a set of rear wheels to be braked. The front wheels are each provided with a pair of sliding brake discs that rotate with the wheel hub and slidable on their respective wheel hubs. At least three front friction elements are associated with each pair of the front brake discs and are supported on a caliper in interleaved relation with the associated front brake discs. The rear wheels are each provided with a single brake disc that is mounted on and rotates with a respective rear wheel drum and is slidable along the respective drum on which it is mounted. Each single rear disc has a pair of friction elements that are mounted by a caliper in straddling relation to the associated single rear brake disc. An actuator system is provided for selectively actuating the friction elements to displace the friction elements and sliding discs into and out of braking engagement with one another. No such braking system is taught or suggested by Carre et. al, and as such the rejection of claim 16 is believed to be improper and should be withdrawn. Apparently, the examiner may be interpreting the phrase "a single rear brake disc associated with each rear wheel" as somehow being open to an interpretation that could include multiple rear wheel brake discs, even though the claim says a single rear brake disc. While the applicant believes that the claim as written is sufficiently clear on this point, the word "only" has been added to emphasize that the word "single" means one, and is not open to meaning multiple as asserted by the examiner.

It is believed that these amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance or at least in better condition for appeal. No new matter has been added and no further consideration needs to be given by the examiner except for

Appln. No.: 10/089,011
Amdt. dated October 19, 2004
Reply to Office action of August 23, 2004

reconsidering the merits of the rejection. It is respectfully requested, therefore, that these amendments be entered and the case be allowed.

It is believed that this application now is in condition for allowance. Further and favorable action is requested.

The Patent Office is authorized to charge or refund any fee deficiency or excess to Deposit Account No. 08-2789.

Respectfully submitted,

HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS, P.C.



Robert L. Stearns, Registration No. 36,937
The Pinehurst Office Center, Suite #101
39400 Woodward Avenue
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304-5151
(248) 723-0427

October , 2004
Date